

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,777	06/30/2003	Michael S. Cooper	P97274-4	5701
28548 75	90 04/06/2006		EXAMINER	
STONEMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD			LEE, KEVIN L	
3113 NORTH 3 PHOENIX, AZ			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3753	
			DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/611,777	COOPER, MICHAEL S.			
	•	Examiner	Art Unit			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	KEVIN L. LEE	3753			
Period fe		pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte afte - If NO - Failt Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. If SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the course the application to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 J	lanuary 2006.				
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-9,13,14 and 22-25</u> is/are pending i	in the application.				
.,6	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)⊠	Claim(s) <u>25</u> is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-9,13,14 and 22-24</u> is/are rejected.					
7)[Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examin-	er				
•	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		e Examiner.			
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	ce Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)[a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document Copies of the Copies o	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applica prity documents have been recei au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Stage			
2) Noti	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 3753

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment filed January 12, 2006 has been thoroughly reviewed and considered by the examiner. The indicated allowability of claims 1-9, 13, 14 and 22-24 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Jackson et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,848,513), Suddeth (U.S. Patent No. 5,058,758) and Vrame (U.S. Patent No. 6,573,449) and reconsideration of the Dumser et al reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,381,902). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9, 14 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,848,513). The patent to Jackson et al discloses a method of protecting at least one fire sprinkler riser system (110) of a fire-protectable structure, the method comprising providing a protective enclosure (114) around the fire sprinkler riser system (110), attaching the protective enclosure (114) to a fire-protectable structure, col. 7, lines 5-8 and operatively connecting the riser system

(110) to a fire sprinkler system (10), col. 5, line 11 thru col. 6, line 62. The enclosure (114) includes a cover (114c) and indicia, see Figures 1-3. The riser system (110) is pre-installed in the protective enclosure (114) and is transportable as a unit in the protective enclosure, col. 4, lines 44-47. It would have been obvious as a matter of expedient design to attach the protective enclosure to the structure prior to connecting the riser system to the fire sprinkler system so that the protective enclosure and riser system are disposed in the desired position and the connected fluid lines and hoses are properly fitted.

Page 3

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al in view of Vrame (U.S. Patent No. 6,573,449). The protective enclosure (114) of Jackson et al is disclosed to be mounted to a structure such as a wall, col. 7, lines 6-8. The protective enclosure of Jackson et al lacks having a mud-ring. The patent to Vrame teaches providing a mud-ring (200) with a protective enclosure (100), the mud-ring (200) to install the protective enclosure to a wall panel (P), col. 2, lines 44-52. In view of the teaching of Vrame, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Jackson et al to include a mud-ring as an alternate means of installing the protective enclosure to the wall.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al in view of Suddeth (U.S. Patent No. 5,058,758). The protective enclosure (114) of Jackson et al lacks having a transparent window. The patent to Suddeth teaches

Art Unit: 3753

providing a transparent window (52) in a protective enclosure (B) so that the internal components can be viewed with the protective enclosure in place, col. 3, lines 36-39. In view of the teaching of Suddeth, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Jackson et al to include a transparent window in the protective enclosure so that the internal components in the enclosure can be viewed with the enclosure in place without having to open the cover.

Claims 1-8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beukema et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,720,351) in view of Dumser et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,381,902). The patent to Beukema et al discloses a fire sprinkler riser system (40) that is connected to a fire sprinkler system (10, 18). The riser system (40) lacks having a protective enclosure. The patent to Dumser et al teaches a protective enclosure (20) for a riser system (1, 2), the protective enclosure (20) being mounted directly to a wall and includes a cover (20b), col. 3, lines 58-60 and col. 4, line 61. Hollow spaces in the packing of the protective enclosure provide storage spaces for components, such as sprinkler heads, col. 2, lines 2-8. The protective enclosure (20) allows the riser system (1, 2) to be transported and installed as a preassembled unit, col. 1, lines 62-66. In view of the teaching of Dumser et al, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Beukema et al to include enclosing the fire sprinkler riser system in a protective enclosure so that the riser assembly is transported and installed as a preassembled unit to reduce the cost and time of assembly of the riser system.

Application/Control Number: 10/611,777

Art Unit: 3753

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 25 is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN L. LEE whose telephone number is (571) 272-4915. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ERIC KEASEL can be reached on (571) 272-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

APRIL 3, 2006

Primary Examiner

Page 5